

The Frankl-Pach upper bound is not tight for any uniformity

Gennian Ge^{*} Zixiang Xu[†] Chi Hoi Yip[‡] Shengtong Zhang[§] Xiaochen Zhao^{*}

December 17, 2024

Abstract

For any positive integers $n \geq d + 1 \geq 3$, what is the maximum size of a $(d + 1)$ -uniform set system in $[n]$ with VC-dimension at most d ? In 1984, Frankl and Pach initiated the study of this fundamental problem and provided an upper bound $\binom{n}{d}$ via an elegant algebraic proof. Surprisingly, in 2007, Mubayi and Zhao showed that when n is sufficiently large and d is a prime power, the Frankl-Pach upper bound is not tight. They also remarked that their method requires d to be a prime power, and asked for new ideas to improve the Frankl-Pach upper bound without extra assumptions on n and d .

In this paper, we provide an improvement for any $d \geq 2$ and $n \geq 2d + 2$, which demonstrates that the long-standing Frankl-Pach upper bound $\binom{n}{d}$ is not tight for any uniformity. Our proof combines a simple yet powerful polynomial method and structural analysis.

1 Introduction

The *Vapnik-Chervonenkis dimension* (*VC-dimension*) is a cornerstone concept in statistical learning and machine learning. It quantifies the capacity of a set of functions and assesses a model's potential to generalize beyond its training data. Widely applied in computational learning theory, artificial intelligence, and statistical inference, the VC-dimension plays a pivotal role in analyzing classification algorithms and evaluating the performance of machine learning models. Its formal definition is as follows.

Definition 1.1. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^V$ be a set system on the ground set V . The VC-dimension of \mathcal{F} is the largest size of subset $S \subseteq V$ such that for every subset $S' \subseteq S$, there exists a member $F_{S'} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F_{S'} \cap S = S'$.

A natural question that arises is: What is the maximum size of a set system with a given VC-dimension? This fundamental question in the theory of VC-dimension was independently resolved in the 1970s by three different groups [17, 18, 20].

Lemma 1.2. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^V$ be a set system with VC-dimension at most d , then $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \sum_{i=0}^d \binom{|V|}{i}$.

^{*}School of Mathematical Sciences, Capital Normal University, Beijing, China. Emails: gnge@zju.edu.cn, 3535935416@qq.com. Gennian Ge was supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China under Grant 2020YFA0712100, the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 12231014, and Beijing Scholars Program.

[†]Extremal Combinatorics and Probability Group (ECOPRO), Institute for Basic Science (IBS), Daejeon, South Korea. Email: zixiangxu@ibs.re.kr. Supported by IBS-R029-C4.

[‡]School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, United States. Email: cyip30@gatech.edu

[§]Department of Mathematics, Stanford University, USA. E-mail address: stzh1555@stanford.edu

Furthermore, the upper bound in Lemma 1.2 is sharp, as shown by considering a Hamming ball with radius d . Lemma 1.2 also stands as an important result in extremal combinatorics. In particular, the connection between VC-dimension and extremal combinatorics has sparked significant excitement in recent years; see for example [3, 6, 7, 8, 13, 16, 19].

While Lemma 1.2 provides a tight upper bound for non-uniform set systems with a given VC-dimension, it is natural to investigate the maximum size of a uniform set system with small VC-dimension. Indeed, in the 1980s, Frankl and Pach [9] initiated the study of this fundamental problem and provided a clean upper bound with an elegant proof.

Theorem 1.3 ([9]). *Let n, d be positive integers with $n \geq d + 1$. If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{d+1}$ is a set system with VC-dimension at most d , then $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n}{d}$.*

Frankl and Pach [9] as well Erdős [5] further conjectured that for sufficiently large n , the maximum value is $\binom{n-1}{d}$ achieved when \mathcal{F} forms a star. However, two unexpected results emerged over the past four decades:

- (1) In 1997, Ahlswede and Khachatrian [1] disproved the above conjecture by constructing such a set system of size $\binom{n-1}{d} + \binom{n-4}{d-2}$ when $n \geq 2(d+1)$.
- (2) In 2007, Mubayi and Zhao [15] cleverly combined the high-order inclusion matrix and the sunflower lemma to show that, when $d = p^t$ for some prime p and positive integer t and n is sufficiently large relative to d , the size of such a set system is at most $\binom{n}{d} - \log_p n + C_d$, where C_d is related to the sunflower lemma [2, 4]. They also remarked [15, Proposition 10] that their method requires d to be a prime power, and claimed that improving the Frankl-Pach upper bound for other values of d will most likely require some new ideas.

In this paper, we show that the upper bound in Theorem 1.3 can be improved for all positive integers n, d with $d \geq 2$ and $n \geq 2d + 2$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let n, d be positive integers with $d \geq 2$ and $n \geq 2d + 2$. If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{d+1}$ is a set system with VC-dimension at most d , then $|\mathcal{F}| < \binom{n}{d}$.*

In particular the condition $n \geq 2d + 2$ is optimal since when $n = 2d + 1$, the upper bound $\binom{n}{d}$ is achieved by $\mathcal{F} = \binom{[n]}{d+1}$, which was remarked by Frankl and Pach [9]. Our proof combines a simple yet powerful polynomial method with clean structural analysis. We begin with a concise proof of Theorem 1.3 in Section 2 as an introductory step, which we then refine to establish Theorem 1.4 in Section 3.

Notations. We usually regard $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ as the ground set. For a subset $A \subseteq [n]$, we use $\binom{A}{k}$ to denote the family of all subsets of A with size k and $\binom{A}{\leq k}$ to denote the family of all subsets of A with size at most k ; we also use $\mathbf{v}_A \in \{0, 1\}^n$ to denote the characteristic vector of A . For a set system \mathcal{F} , we denote the k -shadow of \mathcal{F} as $\partial_k \mathcal{F} := \{T \in \binom{[n]}{k} : T \subseteq F \text{ for some } F \in \mathcal{F}\}$. We write $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ and use $V_{n,d}$ to denote the vector space spanned by monomials in $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ with degree at most d .

2 Warm-up: Frankl-Pach upper bound via polynomial method

In this section, we provide an alternative proof of Theorem 1.3 using the multi-linear polynomial method. The following triangular criterion is useful for proving that a sequence of polynomials is linearly independent.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$. If $\mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \mathbf{v}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{v}^{(m)}$ are vectors in \mathbb{R}^n such that $f_i(\mathbf{v}^{(i)}) \neq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $f_i(\mathbf{v}^{(j)}) = 0$ for $i > j$, then f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m are linearly independent.*

We then build the following relationship between the size of \mathcal{F} and its d -shadow, which also implies the result in Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{d+1}$ be a set system with VC-dimension at most d , then $|\mathcal{F}| \leq |\partial_d \mathcal{F}|$.*

We remark that Theorem 2.2 is of independent interest. For instance, it extends the celebrated Katona's shadow theorem [10], which asserts that any $(d+1)$ -uniform intersecting family \mathcal{F} satisfies $|\mathcal{F}| \leq |\partial_d \mathcal{F}|$; this follows from the fact that any such intersecting family has VC-dimension at most d .

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_m\} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{d+1}$ be a set system with VC-dimension at most d . We now consider the following set systems and their corresponding polynomials.

1. Since the VC-dimension of \mathcal{F} is at most d , for each set $F_i \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists some B_i such that $F_i \cap F \neq B_i$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$. For each $F_i \in \mathcal{F}$, let $f_{F_i}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j \in B_i} x_j \cdot \prod_{j \in F_i \setminus B_i} (x_j - 1) - \prod_{j \in F_i} x_j$.
2. Let $\mathcal{H} = \binom{[n]}{\leq d-1}$. For each set $H \in \mathcal{H}$, define $h_H(\mathbf{x}) = (\sum_{j=1}^n x_j - d - 1) \cdot \prod_{j \in H} x_j$.
3. Let $\mathcal{G} = \binom{[n]}{d} \setminus \partial_d \mathcal{F}$. For each set $G \in \mathcal{G}$, define $g_G(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j \in G} x_j$.

Claim 2.3. *The polynomials $\{f_{F_i}\}_{F_i \in \mathcal{F}}$, $\{h_H\}_{H \in \mathcal{H}}$, and $\{g_G\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}}$ are linearly independent.*

Proof of claim. We shall show that these polynomials satisfy the triangular criterion in Lemma 2.1 by evaluating them on the characteristic vectors \mathbf{v}_A for $A \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G} \cup \mathcal{H}$. We consider the following six cases:

- For distinct $F_i, F_j \in \mathcal{F}$ with $i > j$, first, it is evident that $f_{F_i}(\mathbf{v}_{F_j}) = -1$ since $B_i \neq F_i$. Moreover, since $F_j \cap F_i \neq B_i$, we can see $f_{F_i}(\mathbf{v}_{F_j}) = 0$.
- For any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $H \in \mathcal{H}$, we have $h_H(\mathbf{v}_F) = 0$ since $|F| = d+1$.
- For any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $G \in \mathcal{G}$, we have $g_G(\mathbf{v}_F) = 0$ since G does not belong to $\partial_d \mathcal{F}$.
- For the sets in the family \mathcal{H} , we sort them by size in non-decreasing order, placing smaller sets before larger ones. That is, for distinct $H_i, H_j \in \mathcal{H}$, we have $|H_j| \leq |H_i|$ if and only if $j \leq i$. First, it is easy to check that $h_{H_i}(\mathbf{v}_{H_i}) \neq 0$ since $0 \leq |H_i| \leq d-1$. Furthermore, we observe that when $i > j$, $h_{H_i}(\mathbf{v}_{H_j}) = 0$, because $|H_j| \leq |H_i|$ implies that $H_i \not\subseteq H_j$.
- For any $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and $G \in \mathcal{G}$, obviously we have $g_G(\mathbf{v}_H) = 0$ since $|H| \leq d-1 < d$.
- For any distinct $G_i, G_j \in \mathcal{G}$, we have $g_{G_i}(\mathbf{v}_{G_i}) = 1$ and $g_{G_i}(\mathbf{v}_{G_j}) = 0$ since $|G_i| = |G_j|$ implies that $G_i \not\subseteq G_j$.

This finishes the proof. ■

By Claim 2.3, we have $|\mathcal{F}| + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \binom{n}{i} + \binom{n}{d} - |\partial_d \mathcal{F}| \leq \sum_{i=0}^d \binom{n}{i}$ since these polynomials are in the vector space $V_{n,d}$, which has dimension $\sum_{i=0}^d \binom{n}{i}$. This yields $|\mathcal{F}| \leq |\partial_d \mathcal{F}|$, as desired. □

3 Proof of Theorem 1.4

To prove Theorem 1.4, we can assume that $|\mathcal{F}| = \binom{n}{d} = |\partial_d \mathcal{F}|$ by Theorem 2.2. Our proof then consists of two parts, we first introduce an additional polynomial in $V_{n,d}$, hoping that this new polynomial is linearly independent from the polynomials $\{f_{F_i}\}_{F_i \in \mathcal{F}}$ and $\{h_H\}_{H \in \mathcal{H}}$ in the proof of Theorem 2.2, thereby achieving an improvement. Otherwise, we can derive a desirable combinatorial property (see Claim 3.1) about this set system. However, based on an application of the classical Kruskal-Katona theorem, such a combinatorial property cannot hold.

3.1 Adding an extra polynomial

For each set $Y \in \binom{[n]}{d+1} \setminus \mathcal{F}$, and for each proper subset $Z \subsetneq Y$ and define the following polynomial

$$y_{Y,Z}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j \in Z} x_j \cdot \prod_{j \in Y \setminus Z} (x_j - 1) - \prod_{j \in Y} x_j.$$

Observe that $y_{Y,Z}$ has degree at most d and thus lies in the vector space $V_{n,d}$.

Claim 3.1. *If $|\mathcal{F}| = \binom{n}{d}$, then for each $Y \in \binom{[n]}{d+1} \setminus \mathcal{F}$ and each $Z \subsetneq Y$, there is exactly one i such that $F_i \cap Y = Z = B_i$.*

Proof of claim. Suppose that there exists some pair (Y, Z) such that the number of $F_i \in \mathcal{F}$ with $F_i \cap Y = Z = B_i$ is $m_0 \neq 1$. We then claim that $y_{Y,Z}, \{f_{F_i}\}_{F_i \in \mathcal{F}}$ and $\{h_H\}_{H \in \mathcal{H}}$ are linearly independent, which implies that $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n}{d} - 1$, a contradiction. To see this, suppose there exist coefficients (that are not all zero) $\alpha, \beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m)$, and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_w)$, where $w = |\mathcal{H}| = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \binom{n}{i}$, such that

$$\alpha \cdot y_{Y,Z} + \sum_{i \in [m]} \beta_i f_{F_i} + \sum_{j \in [w]} \gamma_j h_{H_j} = 0.$$

Note that $y_{Y,Z}(\mathbf{v}_Y) = -1$ and $y_{Y,Z}(\mathbf{v}_{F_i})$ equals $(-1)^{d+1-|Z|}$ if $Y \cap F_i = Z$ and equals 0 otherwise. $f_{F_i}(\mathbf{v}_Y)$ equals $(-1)^{d+1-|B_i|}$ if $Y \cap F_i = B_i$ and equals 0 otherwise. Combining the previous argument in the proof of Claim 2.3, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & \mathbf{T}^\top & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{R} & -\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{F}} & \mathbf{0} \\ * & * & \mathbf{A} \end{pmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0},$$

where the vectors $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_{|\mathcal{F}|})^\top$ and $\mathbf{R} = (R_1, \dots, R_{|\mathcal{F}|})^\top$ are given by

$$T_i = f_{F_i}(\mathbf{v}_Y) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{d+1-|B_i|}, & \text{if } Y \cap F_i = B_i \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$R_i = y_{Y,Z}(\mathbf{v}_{F_i}) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{d+1-|Z|}, & \text{if } Y \cap F_i = Z \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

\mathbf{E} is the identity matrix and \mathbf{A} is a $w \times w$ lower triangular matrix.

Denote the coefficient matrix by \mathbf{D} . The matrix \mathbf{D} must be singular; otherwise, the system would have only the trivial solution for (α, β, γ) . On the other hand, using the elementary row operations, we can transform \mathbf{D} into the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 + \mathbf{T}^\top \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{R} & -\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{F}} & \mathbf{0} \\ * & * & \mathbf{A} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We can directly compute that

$$\mathbf{T}^\top \mathbf{R} = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{F}|} T_i R_i = m_0.$$

As $m_0 \neq 1$, the transformed matrix is lower triangular, yielding that the coefficient matrix \mathbf{D} is also invertible, a contradiction. This finishes the proof. \blacksquare

3.2 Impossibility via the Kruskal-Katona theorem

We now show that the property given in Claim 3.1 can never be satisfied when $n \geq 2d + 2$. We shall make use of the Kruskal-Katona theorem [11, 12]; see also [14, Exercise. 13.31(b)].

Theorem 3.2 (Kruskal-Katona theorem). *For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$, if \mathcal{G} is a $(d+1)$ -uniform set family with $|\mathcal{G}| = \binom{\alpha}{d+1}$, then*

$$|\partial_d \mathcal{G}| \geq \binom{\alpha}{d} = |\mathcal{G}| \cdot \frac{d+1}{\alpha-d}.$$

More precisely, we can show the following result, which implies Theorem 1.4.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $n \geq 2d + 2$. Then there is no $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, \dots, F_m\} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{d+1}$ together with $B_i \subseteq F_i$ and $|\mathcal{F}| = \binom{n}{d}$ satisfying the following properties simultaneously:*

- (1) *For each $Y \in \binom{[n]}{d+1} \setminus \mathcal{F}$ and each $Z \subsetneq Y$, there exists exactly one $F_i \in \mathcal{F}$ with $F_i \cap Y = Z = B_i$.*
- (2) *$F_i \cap F_j \neq B_i$ for any $1 \leq i, j \leq m$.*

Proof of Proposition 3.3. We consider the set system $\mathcal{Y} = \binom{[n]}{d+1} \setminus \mathcal{F}$ with $|\mathcal{Y}| = \binom{n}{d+1} - \binom{n}{d}$. By property (1), for each $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and each $Z \subseteq Y$ of size d , there is exactly one $i \in [m]$ such that $F_i \cap Y = Z = B_i$. On the other hand, for each B_i of size d , there are $n - d - 1$ many $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ containing B_i . Thus, we have

$$\partial_d \mathcal{Y} = \{B_i : |B_i| = d\}.$$

Observe that if $i \neq j$ and $|B_i| = |B_j| = d$, then $B_i \neq B_j$, for otherwise $F_i \cap F_j = B_i$, violating the property (2) of \mathcal{F} . This shows that $|\partial_d \mathcal{Y}| = |\{1 \leq i \leq m : |B_i| = d\}|$.

Double counting the number of pairs (Y, i) with $Y \cap F_i = B_i$ and $|B_i| = d$, we can obtain

$$|\partial_d \mathcal{Y}| \cdot (n - d - 1) = (d + 1) \cdot |\mathcal{Y}|,$$

which yields that

$$|\partial_d \mathcal{Y}| = \frac{d+1}{n-d-1} \cdot |\mathcal{Y}|.$$

Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$ be the real number satisfying $|\mathcal{Y}| = \binom{\alpha}{d+1}$. Theorem 3.2 then implies that

$$\frac{d+1}{n-d-1} \geq \frac{|\partial_d \mathcal{Y}|}{|\mathcal{Y}|} \geq \frac{d+1}{\alpha-d},$$

which gives $\alpha \geq n - 1$. Therefore we have

$$\binom{n}{d+1} - \binom{n}{d} = |\mathcal{Y}| \geq \binom{n-1}{d+1}$$

which is impossible by direct computation, since

$$\binom{n}{d+1} - \binom{n}{d} - \binom{n-1}{d+1} = \binom{n-1}{d} - \binom{n}{d} < 0.$$

This finishes the proof. \square

4 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we focus on a fundamental yet unresolved question: what is the maximum size of a $(d+1)$ -uniform set system if its VC-dimension is bounded above by d ? The main contribution of this work is to show that the longstanding Frankl-Pach upper bound $\binom{n}{d}$ is not tight for any uniformity. Meanwhile, we provide a simple polynomial method that establishes a direct connection between the set system and its shadow, which generalizes Katona's shadow theorem [10]. We believe that by appropriately refining our proof, the upper bound in Theorem 1.4 can still be further improved. However, completely resolving this long-standing problem might require the introduction of new approaches.

References

- [1] R. Ahlswede and L. H. Khachatrian. Counterexample to the Frankl-Pach conjecture for uniform, dense families. *Combinatorica*, 17(2):299–301, 1997.
- [2] R. Alweiss, S. Lovett, K. Wu, and J. Zhang. Improved bounds for the sunflower lemma. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 194(3):795–815, 2021.
- [3] J. Balogh, A. Bernshteyn, M. Delcourt, A. Ferber, and H. T. Pham. Sunflowers in set systems with small VC-dimension. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv: 2408.04165, 2024.
- [4] P. Erdős and R. Rado. Intersection theorems for systems of sets. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 35:85–90, 1960.
- [5] P. Erdős. On some problems in graph theory, combinatorial analysis and combinatorial number theory. In *Graph theory and combinatorics (Cambridge, 1983)*, pages 1–17. Academic Press, London, 1984.
- [6] J. Fox, J. Pach, and A. Suk. Erdős-Hajnal conjecture for graphs with bounded VC-dimension. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 61(4):809–829, 2019.
- [7] J. Fox, J. Pach, and A. Suk. Bounded VC-dimension implies the Schur-Erdős conjecture. *Combinatorica*, 41(6):803–813, 2021.
- [8] J. Fox, J. Pach, and A. Suk. Sunflowers in set systems of bounded dimension. *Combinatorica*, 43(1):187–202, 2023.
- [9] P. Frankl and J. Pach. On disjointly representable sets. *Combinatorica*, 4(1):39–45, 1984.
- [10] G. Katona. Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, 15:329–337, 1964.
- [11] G. Katona. A theorem of finite sets. In *Theory of Graphs (Proc. Colloq., Tihany, 1966)*, pages 187–207. Academic Press, New York-London, 1968.
- [12] J. B. Kruskal. The number of simplices in a complex. In *Mathematical optimization techniques*, pages 251–278. Univ. California Press, Berkeley-Los Angeles, Calif., 1963.
- [13] H. Liu, C. Shangguan, J. Skokan, and Z. Xu. Beyond the chromatic threshold via (p, q) -theorem, and a sharp blow-up phenomenon. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv: 2403.17910, 2024.
- [14] L. Lovász. *Combinatorial problems and exercises*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, 1979.

- [15] D. Mubayi and Y. Zhao. On the VC-dimension of uniform hypergraphs. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 25(1):101–110, 2007.
- [16] T. Nguyen, A. Scott, and P. Seymour. Induced subgraph density. VI. Bounded VC-dimension. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv: 2312.15572, 2023.
- [17] N. Sauer. On the density of families of sets. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A*, 13:145–147, 1972.
- [18] S. Shelah. A combinatorial problem; stability and order for models and theories in infinitary languages. *Pac. J. Math.*, 41:247–261, 1972.
- [19] A. Suk. On short edges in complete topological graphs. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv: 2307.08165, 2023.
- [20] V. N. Vapnik and A. Y. Chervonenkis. On the uniform convergence of relative frequencies of events to their probabilities. In *Measures of complexity*, pages 11–30. Springer, Cham, 2015. Reprint of Theor. Probability Appl. **16** (1971), 264–280.